

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Such an amendment is based on claim 2 and has been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mizuno et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites a semiconductor device that includes a “transparent” glass plate that covers a circuit element forming a hollow airtight portion between a supporting substrate and the glass plate. The use of a “transparent” glass plate facilitates the visual inspection and also the removal of the semiconductor device if a device fabrication failure has occurred. (See page 3, lines 11-16 of the application) The background section of the application points out that in prior art devices use a non-glass plate (e.g., ceramic) preventing the visual inspection of the device once the device is sealed. (See page 2, lines 5-10 of the application)

Mizuno discloses a device that includes a main body 2 and a cap 6. However, the cap is formed from ceramic and according to one embodiment, alumina is used (See column 4, lines 37-42), in contrast to a “transparent” glass plate as recited in claim 1. Although Mizuno mentions the use of glass during the sealing process, it is in the context of coating the sealing material 15 (See column 6, lines 34-40), and not as a “transparent” glass plate as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated for at least this reason.

Moreover, the use of ceramic or alumina for the cap makes the cap non-transparent. In fact, the use of ceramic prevents the visual inspection of the components of the device. (See page 2, lines 5-10 of the current application) Mizuno is concerned with the sealing qualities of the cap 6 and not transparency. As pointed out by the Office action, Mizuno states that “the main body 2 and the car are formed of ceramic ... In this case, the package main body 2 is fabricated by a well know **green sheet** laminating process with a shape where, for example, 5 sheets of **alumina** substrates 2a through 2e are laminated.” (See column 4, lines 36-41) That is,

Applicant : Haruo Hyodo et al.  
Serial No. : 09/963,839  
Filed : September 26, 2001  
Page : 5 of 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-100001 / F51-  
136641M/TOM

Mizuno suggests that the body 2 and cap 6 can be made of green sheets of alumina which are non-transparent. Thus, Mizuno fails to teach or suggest a "transparent" glass plate as recited in claim 1.

Since claims 3-7 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, they should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Consequently, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the applications.